

**From:** Andrew Chen  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 10:09pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

I agree with all of the statements found at:  
<http://www.kegel.com/remedy/letter.html>

Competition is good. Period.

Competition should be fostered. Period.

Innovation will not be stifled by competition. Period.

Anti-trust legislation exists to ensure that there is competition. Period.

At a minimum, complete and full disclosure to the public, available without signing or consenting to any restriction on activities enabled as a consequence of, of all Microsoft APIs and source code of any sort for a period of time (I'd recommend 5 years) for all products being sold (including pre-orders), would ensure competition for Microsoft. They're a big company, they can handle it. They may need to refocus on mice and keyboards and the x-box hardware and technical support contracts as primary sources of revenue, but quite frankly, that's what the a substantial portion of the desktop PC industry has to do (either they're a hardware vendor, or, like Linux based companies, make money off of selling technical support contracts - Microsoft dominates too much of the software industry for any other software companies to be seriously considered as a significant part of the desktop PC industry, when looked at in terms of total revenue generated). Why should Microsoft be treated any different? Certainly not because of it's past crimes (it should suffer some form of punitive damage).

Encourage competition. Period.

That's your job as enforcers of Anti-Trust law. Period.

--

Andrew Chen  
<http://www.andrewsw.com>